

The "Self" Versus "Other" Perspective and Grammatical Theory

著者(英)	Minoru WATANABE
翻訳者(英)	John H. Haig
校正者(英)	Stephen Wright HORN
journal or publication title	Pioneering Linguistic Works in Japan
page range	1-29
year	2021-02
URL	http://doi.org/10.15084/00003112

The “Self” Versus “Other” Perspective and Grammatical Theory

WATANABE Minoru

Keywords: self, other, auxiliary verbs, giving and receiving verbs, hypothetical condition versus confirmatory conjunction, *noda* construction, history of demonstratives

Abstract:

Words come from an individual speaker, but by the act of leaving the individual speaker, they become an objective sentence. At the last step before the words leave the speaker, there can be thought to be a level in Japanese by which it is decided whether they should be taken as being about the speaker himself (“self”) or about something unrelated to the speaker (“other”). This appears to correspond to distinctions in person in Western languages, but it is a Japanese characteristic that this is concentrated in a linear form in the auxiliary verbs that attach following the predicate and in the set of final particles that follow them. In addition, there are many areas in grammar, such as giving and receiving expressions and the *noda* construction, among others, that can be explained using the “self” versus “other” perspective.

1.

Investigating adverbial expressions, one runs across aspects that catch one’s attention. One of them is what I am referring to as “self” versus “other” in this article and I would like here to try considering the various areas in grammatical theory that this perspective may be applied to, but when advancing a discussion using expressions such as these, chosen by myself, as though they were accepted terms, the proper path to follow is probably to begin with unshakable linguistic facts.

The adverb *zuibun* used in the following sentences is one of what are called degree adverbs and bears as its meaning that the extent of some quality or condition is “large”, and, accordingly, we can describe it structurally as adverbially modifying the adjective or nominal adjective that carries the meaning of some quality or condition.

<u>Zuibun</u>	<i>otonasii</i>	<i>otoko</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>ne.</i>
very	quiet	man	COP	FP
‘He’s a very quiet man, isn’t he?’				

<i>Ima</i>	<i>syuppatu</i>	<i>suru</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>kare</i>	<i>mo</i>
now	leave	do	QUOTE	TOP	he	also
<u>zuibun</u>	<i>ranboo</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>ne.</i>			
very	reckless	COP	FP			
‘He’s very reckless, isn’t he, saying he’s going to leave now.’						

The *taihen* appearing in the following sentences can be similarly described.

Taihen *otonasii* *otoko* *da* *ne.*
 very quiet man COP FP
 ‘He’s a very quiet man, isn’t he?’

Dare *ga* *nan* *to* *ioo* *to*
 who NOM what QUOTE say.CONJEC if
kare *wa* *taihen* *ranboo* *da* *yo.*
 he TOP very reckless COP FP
 ‘No matter what anyone says, he’s very reckless.’

It can be seen that they are also similar in that, being unable to appear in comparative sentences like the following, both belong to the category I have called “discovery/non-evaluative”.¹

**Kare* *wa* *kanozyo* *yor* *taihen* *iroz* *da.*
 he TOP her than very white/pale COP
 ‘He is much paler than she is.’

**Kare* *wa* *kanozyo* *yor* *zuibun* *iroz* *da.*
 he TOP her than very white/pale COP
 ‘He is much paler than she is.’

However, although *zuibun* and *taihen* belong to the same category, there are some slight differences in their actual use. *Taihen* can appear in both the following sentences:

Kono *hon* *wa* *taihen* *buatui* *ne.*
 this book TOP very thick FP
 ‘This book is very thick, isn’t it?’

Watasi *wa* *taihen* *uresii* *yo.*
 I TOP very happy FP
 ‘I’m very happy.’

In contrast, *zuibun* can appear in the context of the former but not the latter, showing a bias:

Kono *hon* *wa* *zuibun* *buatui* *ne.*
 this book TOP very thick FP
 ‘This book is very thick, isn’t it?’

**Watasi* *wa* *zuibun* *uresii* *yo.*
 I TOP very happy FP
 ‘I’m very happy.’

When we add some more kinds of examples and arrange them, we can see that, while *taihen* does not select each word and can cooccur with and form an adverbial modification relationship with pretty much any word as long as it is a (nominal) adjective, *zuibun* has cooccurrence constraints even though the word may satisfy the condition of being a (nominal) adjective.

<i>taihen</i>	<i>buatui/</i>	<i>akarui/</i>	<i>sizukada/</i>	<i>otonasii/</i>	<i>takumasii/</i>
very	thick	bright	silent	quiet	strong
	<i>sunaoda/...</i>				
	honest				
	<i>uresii/</i>	<i>kanasii/</i>	<i>tanosii/</i>	<i>sabisii/</i>	<i>sukida/ kiraida</i>
	happy	sad	enjoyable	lonely	likeable dislikeable

<i>zuibun</i>	<i>buatui/</i>	<i>akarui/</i>	<i>sizukada/</i>	<i>otonasii/</i>	<i>takumasii/</i>
very	thick	bright	silent	quiet	strong
	<i>sunaoda/...</i>				
	honest				
	<i>*uresii/</i>	<i>*kanasii/</i>	<i>*tanosii/</i>	<i>*sabisii/</i>	<i>*sukida/ *kiraida</i>
	happy	sad	enjoyable	lonely	likeable dislikeable

It can probably be seen at a glance that the (nominal) adjectives *zuibun* cannot cooccur with are those that cannot appear as predicates to *kare* ‘he’ even though they can appear as predicates to *watasi* ‘I’.

Watasi wa uresii (kanasii/ tanosii/...).
 I TOP happy sad enjoyable
 ‘I am happy (sad, enjoying it, ...).’

**Kare wa uresii (kanasii/ tanosii/...).*
 he TOP happy sad enjoyable
 ‘He is happy (sad, enjoying it, ...).’

The existence of words like these that, even though they can describe the speaker “I”, cannot describe another “him”, is probably well known, but in this article, I will refer to such words as “self-ness” words. The contrasting concept to “self” is “other” and, to put it briefly, we can say that words like *uresii* ‘happy’ and *kanasii* ‘sad’ have the semantic feature of “self-ness” and words like *buatui* ‘thick’ and *otonasii* ‘quiet’ have the semantic feature of “other-ness”. Turning this around, I would like to interpret this as follows: *Zuibun* ‘very’ has the feature “other-ness” and thus can cooccur with “other” (nominal) adjectives but does not cooccur with “self” (nominal) adjectives because their semantic features are discordant.

We can adduce other linguistic facts that cause us to think of the adverb *zuibun* as having the semantic feature of “other-ness”. One fact that is immediately evident is that, while *zuibun* is constrained by the cooccurrence restriction seen earlier in the following sentence,

**Kare wa zuibun uresii (kanasii/ tanosii/...).*
 he TOP very happy sad enjoyable
 ‘He is very happy (very sad, enjoying it very much, ...).’

if the auxiliary verb *-sooda* ‘looks to be’ is attached following these non-cooccurring “self” (nominal) adjectives, they flip completely and become acceptable expressions.

Kare wa zuibun uresi (kanasi/ tanosi/...) -sooda.
 he TOP very happy sad enjoyable -looks.to.be
 ‘He looks to be very happy (very sad, enjoying it very much, ...).’

The key to this reversal in acceptability is the fact that *-sooda* is an auxiliary verb with the feature “other-ness” that cannot express “self”, as shown by the acceptability and unacceptability of the sentences below and, therefore, restores the ability to cooccur with *zuibun*.

**Watasi wa uresi-sooda.*
 I TOP happy-look.to.be
 ‘I look to be happy.’

**Watasi wa iki-sooda.*
 I TOP go-look.to.be
 ‘I look to be about to go.’

Kare wa uresi-sooda.
 he TOP happy-look.to.be
 ‘He looks to be happy.’

Kare wa iki-sooda.
 he TOP go-look.to.be
 ‘He looks to be about to go.’

This also shows that by attaching the auxiliary verb *-sooda*, the semantic feature of “self-ness” held by *uresii* ‘happy’, *kanasii* ‘sad’, and *tanosii* ‘find enjoyable’ is neutralized, or rather changed to “other-ness”. In Japanese expressions, after the predicate has related something, various auxiliary verbs and particles attach after it and add shades of a different level to the expression. The elements that are attached after appear to work in a way so as to govern those preceding them, and one of the elements that can be attached is “self” versus “other” and it ought to be recognized that, at least at one level, the “self” element (for example, *uresii* ‘happy’), through being followed by an “other” element (for example, *-sooda*), takes a form in which it is governed by that element and undergoes a change to “other”. Consider how the addition of *-seru* ‘causative’ or *-reru* ‘passive’ to a predicate, at a position preceding that of *-sooda*, has the ability to change the case relations of the preceding element:

Kare ga iku. → Kare ni ika-seru.
 he NOM go.NPST him DAT go-CAUS.NPST
 ‘He goes.’ ‘Make him go.’

Inu ga kamu. → Inu ni kama-reru.
 dog NOM bite.NPST dog DAT bite-PASS.NPST
 ‘A dog bites.’ ‘Be bitten by a dog.’

The addition of *-sooda* exhibits a similar phenomenon, albeit at a lower level of strength, and I intend to add some consideration to the question of what level within the predicate expression its effects are observable in the discussion below. Without at least recognizing that there is a neutralization or conversion of semantic features, it is impossible to give a reason for the fact that the cooccurrence restriction of *zuibun* with expressions like *uresii* is cancelled by the addition of *-sooda*.

If, in the realm of predicate expressions, it is *-sooda* that brings in “other-ness”, it is probably the auxiliary verb *-tai* ‘desiderative’ that brings “self-ness” into the same realm of predicate expressions.

Watasi wa iki (kaeri/ nomi/ nemuri ...) -tai.
 I TOP go return drink sleep -DES
 ‘I want to go/ return/ sleep/’

**Kare wa iki (kaeri/ nomi/ nemuri ...) -tai.*
 he TOP go (return drink sleep) -DES
 ‘He wants to go (return/drink/sleep ...).’

As in the above, the so-called desiderative auxiliary verb *-tai* can be used in “self” expressions about the speaker himself but cannot be used in “other” expressions about other people, showing a behavior diametrically contrasting with that of *-sooda*. That *-tai* is a “self-ness” auxiliary verb probably goes without saying, but what we would like to ascertain is whether, through the addition of *-tai*, the “other-ness” semantic feature of the preceding word is neutralized or changed to “self-ness”. Unfortunately, there are few purely “other” forms comparable to purely “self” forms like *uresii*, so it is difficult to confirm this fact. What I would rather consider concerns the fact that Japanese *watasi* and *kare* are not the same as Western first- and third-person pronouns, for example, English, *I* and *he*. It is common sense knowledge that probably does not bear repeating, but among *I*, *he*, and, additionally, *you*, the kind of “self” versus “other” opposition found in Japanese is weak, so much so that sentient subject expressions are at times treated equally with non-sentient subject expressions as being “impersonal”.^a In contrast, in Japanese, in many cases the second person is treated as “other”, in the same class as the third person and stands in opposition to the “self” of the first person.

**Anata wa uresii (kanasii/ tanosii...).*
 you TOP happy sad enjoyable
 ‘You are happy (sad/enjoying something...).’

The distinctions among first-, second-, and third-persons are convenient and worth preserving in Japanese language studies, but I would like it recognized that they do not form a triplet cleanly corresponding to Western personal pronouns.

Something else that is related and worth noting is the existence of the auxiliary verbs *-tai* and *-sooda* themselves. As I have argued in the past, I believe Japanese auxiliary verbs can be categorized into two categories and three types,² as shown in the table below, and among these auxiliary verbs, *-tai* and *-sooda* are somewhat different in nature from the others.

^a Translator’s note: The term impersonal here refers to things outside the dichotomy of “self” and “other”.

	Type 1				Type 2		Type 3
Category A	<i>da</i>				<i>rasii</i>		<i>daroo</i>
Category B	<i>-seru</i>	<i>-reru</i>	<i>-tai</i>	<i>-sooda</i>	<i>-nai</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-o</i>
			<i>-mai</i>				

Auxiliary verbs can be considered to be categorized according to the various colorings they add to the predicate expression, and these can be expected to have a high degree of universality. In fact, most correspond to grammatical categories that must also be set up for Western linguistics with *-seru* ‘causative’ and *-reru* ‘passive’ of Category B, Type 1 corresponding to the category of “voice” in Western linguistics; *-nai* ‘negative’ of Category B, Type 2 corresponding to “negation”, *-ta* ‘past’ of Category B, Type 2 corresponding to “tense” or “aspect”, Type 3 of both Categories A and B corresponding to “mood”, and Types 1 (*da* ‘copula’^b), 2 (*rasii* ‘semblative’), and 3 (*daroo* ‘copula tentative’, *-o* ‘tentative’^c) corresponding to “predication”. Of the auxiliary verbs, *-tai* ‘desiderative’ and *-sooda* ‘evidential’ seem to lack a similarity to universal grammatical categories. Why Japanese should have something like these occupying a proper place among the auxiliary verbs is, if one considers it, something quite strange. Might these actually be a sort of “voice” corresponding to “person” in Western linguistics? Viewed from a perspective I have long advocated in which Japanese is a language that is warm toward the significance affiliated with the linguistic subject while Western languages are languages that pour their energies into the significance affiliated with the linguistic object, it could be thought that people in the West have built up this general contrast as “person” in the context of Western languages and when the category is developed by Japanese in the context of the Japanese language it becomes “self” versus “other”. In this sense, I think that *-tai* and *-sooda* occupy a position in the auxiliary verbs analogous to “person” and, substantively, the personal pronouns *watasi* ‘I’ and *anata/kare* ‘you/he’ are respectively “self” and “other” pronouns; to what extent is this a tenable hypothesis?

^b [Translator’s note] In traditional Japanese grammar, *da* is categorized as an auxiliary verb when appearing after a noun or postpositional phrase (*gakusei da* ‘X is a student’, *soko kara da* ‘It’s from there’) and as a conjugational ending when appearing after a nominal adjective (*keiyōdōshi*), including those formed by the suffixation of *-sooda* (*kireida* ‘It’s pretty’, *uresi-sooda* ‘Appears to be happy’).

^c [Translator’s note] In the original chart, this is *u* rather than *o*, reflecting the *kana* spelling. It attaches to a verb conjugational form ending in *o* creating a long *o*, which is represented in the romanization used here as a geminate *o*. The form *-mai*, not discussed in the text, is used both as a negative tentative (‘probably not’) and as an emphatic refusal (‘absolutely not’).

2.

As a way of bringing the “self” versus “other” perspective set out above into the various domains in grammatical theory, in term of the flow of the discussion, taking up the auxiliary verbs would seem to be the proper order to begin with. We have already covered *-tai* and *-sooda*, so naturally the other auxiliary verbs are now the target of consideration.

Starting from the auxiliary verbs *-seru* and *-reru*, which appear closer to the stem than *-tai* and *-sooda*, what probably first comes to mind are causative expressions and passive expressions that, although natural in Japanese, are hard to find in Western languages. Namely, the so-called “adversity passive” appearing in the following,

Ame ni hura-reru.
rain DAT fall-PASS.NPST
‘Be adversely affected by it raining.’

Haha ni sina-reru.
mother DAT die-PASS.NPST
‘Be adversely affected by one’s mother dying.’

Tonari ni biru o tate-rareru.
next.door LOC building ACC build-PASS.NPST
‘Be adversely affected by someone’s building a building next door.’

brings in a subjective meaning to a verbal expression and corresponds to treating it as a situation that ends up occurring with no connection to one’s own will, that is, an “other” situation. It is an “adversity passive” precisely because having it rain on one is grasped as harm to one’s self and, on this point, appears to be a “self” expression, but “being rained upon” is rightly construed as an “other” expression of a happening that affected one willy-nilly. In Western languages, which largely have a tendency towards impersonality, given a transitive verb, a passive expression in which the object has replaced the subject can be made mechanically, so to speak. Thus, passive expressions with a non-sentient subject are common. In contrast, Japanese, in which a sentence like the following remains a somewhat unnatural expression,

Ekimae ni biru ga tate-rareta.
in.front.of.the.station LOC building NOM build-PASS.PST
‘A building was built in front of the station.’

is poor at stating things completely objectively and even the following sentence, in which the adversity meaning does not stand out, can be thought as depicting *kare* ‘he’ as a victim.

Kare wa inu ni kama-reta.
he TOP dog DAT bite-PASS.PST
‘He was bitten by a dog.’

There are no such clear examples for *-seru* ‘causative’, but the following older example is probably an example of an “other-ness” subjective causative in which something occurred against one’s will,

Kabuto no uti o i-sasete
 helmet GEN inside ACC shoot-CAUS.GER
 ‘letting (not preventing) shooting (an arrow) inside his helmet’

and an expression like the following can be considered to continue that use into the present.

Suki ni sa-sete okinasai.
 like ADV do-CAUS.GER leave.IMP
 ‘Leave him to do as he likes. (=Resign yourself to whatever he does.)’

There is still remaining in the Type 1 auxiliary verbs the Category A *da*, but this can be recognized as the most impersonal of the auxiliary verbs in Japanese. Adducing examples like the following is really not necessary.

Watasi wa gakusei da.
 I TOP student COP
 ‘I am a student’

Kare wa Amerikazin da.
 He TOP American COP
 ‘He is an American.’

Are wa Tosainu da.
 That TOP Tosa.dog COP
 ‘That is a Tosainu (a breed of dog).’

The Type 2 and Type 3 auxiliary verbs still remain, but these seem to fall into two groups.

The concept “impersonal” given earlier is one that transcends the “self” versus “other” dichotomy, but as “self” and “other” are opposing concepts at the same level, they should be in a mutually exclusive relationship. However, in reality, that mutual exclusivity is not so strict. An expression like the following in which the “self” *-tai* is followed by the “other” *-sooda* is acceptable in Japanese.

Kare wa iki-ta-sooda.
 he TOP go-DES-look.to.be
 ‘He appears to want to go.’

An expression like the following without *-sooda* added is unacceptable, but it becomes acceptable when the addition of *-sooda* neutralizes the “self-ness” of *-tai* or converts it to “other”.

**Kare wa iki-tai.*
 he TOP go-DES

This is exactly the same as process as that by which the unacceptable

**Kare wa uresii.*
 He TOP happy
 ‘He is happy’

becomes acceptable by the addition of *-sooda*:

Kare wa uresi-sooda
 he TOP happy-look.to.be
 ‘He looks to be happy.’

On the other hand, the acceptable

Watasi wa uresii. Watasi wa iki-tai.
 I TOP happy I TOP go-DES
 ‘I am happy.’ ‘I want to go.’

become unacceptable with the addition of *-sooda*,

**Watasi wa uresi-sooda. *Watasi wa iki-ta-sooda.*
 I TOP happy-look.to.be I TOP go-DES-look.to.be
 ‘I look to be happy.’ ‘I look like I want to go.’

but this can be judged to be because the “other-ness” of *-sooda* clashes with the “self-ness” of *watasi* ‘I’. With this conversion of “self-ness” in mind, we will take a look at the linguistic facts presented by the Type 2 and Type 3 auxiliary verbs.

Watasi wa uresii.
 I TOP happy
 'I am happy.'

 **Watasi wa uresi-sooda.*
 I TOP happy-look.to.be
 'I look to be happy.'

Watasi wa uresiku-nai.
 I TOP happy-NEG
 'I am not happy.'

Watasi wa uresikat-ta.
 I TOP happy-PST
 'I was happy.'

 **Watasi wa uresii rasii.*
 I TOP happy SEMB
 'I seem to be happy.'

 **Watasi wa uresii daroo.*
 I TOP happy COP.TENT
 'I am probably happy.'

 **Watasi wa uresikaro-o.*
 I TOP happy-TENT
 'I am probably happy.'

Watasi wa iki-tai.
 I TOP go-DES
 'I want to go.'

 **Watasi wa iki-ta-sooda.*
 I top go-DES-look.to.be
 'I look like I want to go.'

Watasi wa iki-taku-nai.
 I TOP go-DES-NEG
 'I don't want to go.'

Watasi wa iki-takat-ta.
 I TOP go-DES-PST
 'I wanted to go.'

 **Watasi wa iki-tai rasii.*
 I TOP go-DES SEMB
 'I seem to want to go.'

 **Watasi wa iki-tai daroo.*
 I go-DES COP.TENT
 'I probably want to go.'

 **Watasi wa iki-takaro-o.*
 I TOP go-DES-TENT
 'I probably want to go.'

**Kare wa uresii.*
 he TOP happy
 'He is happy.'

Kare wa uresi-sooda.
 he TOP happy-look.to.be
 'He looks to be happy.'

 **Kare wa uresiku-nai.*
 he TOP happy-NEG
 'He is not happy.'

 **Kare wa uresikat-ta.*
 he TOP happy-PST
 'He was happy.'

Kare wa uresii rasii.
 he TOP happy SEMB
 'I seem to be happy.'

Kare wa uresii daroo.
 he TOP happy COP.TENT
 'He is probably happy.'

Kare wa uresikaro-o.
 he TOP happy-TENT
 'He is probably happy.'

**Kare wa iki-tai.*
 he TOP go-DES
 'He wants to go.'

Kare wa iki-ta-sooda.
 he top go-DES-look.to.be
 'He looks like he wants to go.'

 **Kare wa iki-taku-nai.*
 he TOP go-DES-NEG
 'He doesn't want to go.'

 **Kare wa iki-takat-ta.*
 he TOP go-DES-PST
 'He wanted to go.'

Kare wa iki-tai rasii.
 he TOP go-DES SEMB
 'I seem to want to go.'

Kare wa iki-tai daroo.
 he TOP go-DES COP.TENT
 'He probably wants to go.'

Kare wa iki-takaro-o.
 he TOP go-DES-TENT
 'He probably wants to go.'

Lining all these examples up like this makes the phenomena appear quite complex, but it can be simplified by noting that, in essence, *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* show the same behavior as *-sooda* and stand in opposition to *-nai* and *-ta*, which show different behavior from *-sooda*. To that degree, the three words *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* are “other” auxiliary verbs. Since the words *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* show the speaker’s assessment or conjecture and can be considered to have a strongly subjective linguistic meaning, one might conclude that they do not belong to the “other” group. However, having a strongly subjective meaning does not mean they carry “self-ness”. Just as with the adversity passive, treating some matter as “other” is also subjective. In brief, although the propositional attitudes of assessment and conjecture are themselves subjective, these are auxiliary verbs involved in judging and require objective elements that are the content of the judgements and thus transform the expressions that precede them into “other-oriented matters”.

On the other hand, can it be said that *-nai* and *-ta* form a “self” group? It does not seem that they do. Broadening our observations to include the following, it appears that the view that *-nai* and *-ta* are not in a “self” versus “other” opposition is the right one.

<p>*<i>Watasi wa uresi-sooda.</i> I TOP happy-look.to.be 'I look to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa uresi-soode-nai.</i> I TOP happy-look.to.be-NEG 'I do not look to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa uresi-soodat-ta.</i> I TOP happy-look.to.be-PST 'I looked to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa uresi-soo rasii.</i> I TOP happy-look.to.be SEMB 'I seem to look to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa uresi-soo daroo.</i> I TOP happy-look.to.be COP.TENT 'I probably look to be happy.'</p>	<p>*<i>Watasi wa iki-sooda.</i> I TOP go-look.to.be 'I look to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa iki-soode-nai.</i> I TOP go-look.to.be-NEG 'I do not look to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa iki-soodat-ta.</i> I TOP go-look.to.be-PST 'I looked to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa iki-soo rasii.</i> I TOP go-look.to.be SEMB 'I seem to look to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Watasi wa iki-soo daroo.</i> I TOP go-look.to.be COP.TENT 'I probably look to be about to go.'</p>
--	---

<p><i>Kare wa uresi-sooda.</i> he TOP happy-look.to.be 'He looks to be happy.'</p> <p><i>Kare wa uresi-soode-nai.</i> he TOP happy-look.to.be-NEG 'He does not look to be happy.'</p> <p><i>Kare wa uresi-soodat-ta.</i> he TOP happy-look.to.be-PST 'He looked to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Kare wa uresi-soo rasii.</i> he TOP happy-look.to.be SEMB He seems to look to be happy.'</p> <p>*<i>Kare wa uresi-soo daroo.</i> he TOP happy-look.to.be COP.TENT 'He probably looks to be happy.'</p>	<p><i>Kare wa iki-sooda.</i> he TOP go-look.to.be 'He looks to be about to go.'</p> <p><i>Kare wa iki-soode-nai.</i> he TOP go-look.to.be-NEG 'He does not look to be about to go.'</p> <p><i>Kare wa iki-soodat-ta.</i> he TOP go-look.to.be-PST 'He looked to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Kare wa iki-soo rasii.</i> he TOP go-look.to.be SEMB 'He seems to look to be about to go.'</p> <p>*<i>Kare wa iki-soo daroo.</i> he TOP go-look.to.be COP.TENT 'He probably looks to be about to go.'</p>
---	---

That is, adding *-nai* or *-ta* to one of the acceptable expressions below yields an acceptable expression and unacceptable expressions followed by *-nai* or *-ta* are all unacceptable expressions.

<i>Watasi wa uresii.</i>	<i>Watasi wa iki-tai.</i>
<i>Kare wa uresi-sooda.</i>	<i>Kare wa iki-sooda.</i>
* <i>Kare wa uresii.</i>	* <i>Kare wa iki-tai.</i>
* <i>Watasi wa uresi-sooda</i>	* <i>Watasi wa iki-sooda.</i>

The kind of behavior observed with *-sooda*, *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o*, where adding one of them to one of the acceptable expressions above leads to unacceptability is not observed with *-nai* and *-ta*. Adding one of *-sooda*, *rasii*, *daroo*, or *-o* to the unacceptable expressions below leads to acceptability, which again is not observed with *-nai* and *-ta*.

* <i>Kare wa uresii.</i>	* <i>Kare wa iki-tai.</i>
--------------------------	---------------------------

Based on these facts, would it not be best to say that *-nai* and *-ta* are “impersonal” auxiliary verbs outside the categories of “self” or “other”?

For the purpose of clarifying the nature of *-nai* and *-ta* contrastively, the power *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* have to reverse acceptability was brought into evidence, but this acceptability-reversing power of *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* does not work effectively for all unacceptable expressions. As seen earlier, adding *rasii*, *daroo*, or *-o* to the following unacceptable expressions does not reverse their acceptability.

**Watasi wa uresi-sooda* **Watasi wa iki-sooda.*

Even though adding *rasii*, *daroo*, or *-o* to a “self” predicate can change it to become “other” to bring it into harmony with an “other” subject, they cannot change an “other” predicate to become “self” to match a “self” subject. This fact both reinforces the identification of *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* as belonging to the “other” group, and, at the same time, is a fact that shows that it is easy to change “self” to “other”, but it is not easy to change “other” to “self”. Of these two facts, possibly the latter should be considered obvious. Japanese *watasi* ‘I’ is without a doubt a “self” pronoun as the subject of predicates like *uresii*, but it is also possible to use it on the same level as *kare* “he”, that is, at the level of an “impersonal” pronoun “I”. On the other hand, it is difficult, even in Japanese, for *kare* to be the subject of a “self” predicate. This would explain the facts at hand quite simply. In essence, “self” is something special. When a Japanese speaker says, “This is something related to me, myself,” with no separation from the heart of the person under discussion, it is a “self” expression. Perhaps “other” could be said to be special as a concept in opposition to “self”.

However, there remains something to note about the “other-ness” of *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o*. It was observed regarding the examples (repeated) below that they were all ungrammatical, and there is no need to revise that observation. However, when the portion preceding these auxiliary verbs is a quotation of another person’s judgement, that is, when the auxiliary verb is “hearsay” *rasii* or “reminder” *daroo*?, then these examples probably must be treated as acceptable.

* <i>Kare wa uresi-soo rasii.</i>	* <i>Kare wa iki-soo rasii.</i>
he TOP happy-look.to.be SEMB	he TOP go-look.to.be SEMB
‘He seems to look to be happy.’	‘He seems to look to be about to go.’
‘(They say) he looks to be happy.’	‘(They say) he looks to be about to go.’

* <i>Kare wa uresi-soo daroo.</i>	* <i>Kare wa iki-soo daroo.</i>
he TOP happy-look.to.be COP.TENT	he TOP go-look.to.be COP.TENT
‘He probably looks to be happy.’	‘He probably looks to be about to go.’
‘He looks to be happy, doesn’t he?’	‘He looks to be about to go, doesn’t he?’

These expressions are not judgements by the speaker himself, but are dependent upon someone else’s judgement through what the speaker has heard, by which the speaker assesses that such and such is probably the case or seeks confirmation as to whether it might be right to recognize that such and such is the case. Such assessments or requests for confirmation are targeted at content very high in “other-ness”, and the “other-ness” of the *rasii*, *daroo*, or *-o* can probably be regarded as making the *-sooda*, which itself belongs to the “other” group, even more strongly “other”. Expressions like the following are probably acceptable, and they probably show “otherization” of *watasi* ‘I’.

Watasi wa uresi-soo rasii.
 I TOP happy-look.to.be SEMB
 ‘I seem to look to be happy.’

Watasi wa iki-soo rasii.
 I TOP go-look.to.be SEMB
 ‘I seem to look to be about to go.’

Watasi wa uresi-soo daroo?
 I TOP happy-look.to.be COP.TENT
 ‘I look to be happy, don’t I?’

Watasi wa iki-soo daroo?
 I TOP go-look.to.be COP.TENT
 ‘I probably look to be about to go, don’t I?’

If one wishes to push the “otherization” of “self” even further, expressions like the following that treat oneself as “other” and are marginal in Japanese might possibly be treated as on the plus side of the line of acceptability.

(*Dooyara*) *watasi wa uresii (iki-tai) rasii.*
 somehow.or.other I TOP happy (go-DES) SEMB
 ‘Somehow or other, I seem to be happy (to want to go).’

(*Sonna keesu nara*) *watasi wa uresii (iki-tai) daroo.*
 such.a case if I TOP happy (go-DES) COP.TENT
 ‘If that were the case, I would probably be happy (want to go).’

However, the possibility of such borderline expressions appears to be shut off when we leave the world of auxiliary verbs and enter the world of sentence-final particles. Could there be any doubt as to the unacceptability of the following examples?

**Watasi wa uresii ka.*
 I TOP happy Q
 ‘Am I happy?’

**Watasi wa iki-tai ka.*
 I TOP go-DES Q
 ‘Do I want to go?’

In which case, the question becomes why it is that what was possible with *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o* is impossible with *ka*, and to pursue this question, we should probably derive the answer by trying the same kind of observations as earlier regarding *ka*. The behavior of *ka* is observed below, and it shows aspects different from any auxiliary verb we have examined thus far.

<i>*Kare wa uresii ka.</i>	<i>(*Kare wa uresii.)</i>
<i>*Kare wa iki-tai ka.</i>	<i>(*Kare wa iki-tai.)</i>
<i>Watasi wa uresi-soo ka.</i>	<i>(*Watasi wa uresi-sooda.)</i>
<i>Watasi wa iki-soo ka.</i>	<i>(*Watasi wa iki-sooda.)</i>
<i>Kare wa uresi-soo ka.</i>	<i>(Kare wa uresi-sooda.)</i>
<i>Kare wa iki-soo ka.</i>	<i>(Kare wa iki-sooda.)</i>

The different behavior presents an impression of extreme complexity, but the resolution of this complicated behavior can be sought in its relation to the second-person pronoun *anata* ‘you’ that we have not touched upon hitherto. Namely, as shown by the unacceptability of the following examples,

<i>*Anata wa uresii.</i>	<i>*Anata wa iki-tai.</i>
you TOP happy	you TOP go-DES
‘You are happy.’	‘You want to go.’

and the acceptability of

<i>Anata wa uresi-sooda.</i>	<i>Anata wa iki-sooda.</i>
you TOP happy-look.to.be	you TOP go-look.to.be
‘You appear to be happy.’	‘You appear to be about to go.’

it is apparent that *anata* is “other”, but if *ka* is added to the above examples, the acceptability/unacceptability is reversed.

<i>Anata wa uresii ka.</i>	<i>Anata wa iki-tai ka.</i>
you TOP happy Q	you TOP go-DES Q
‘Are you happy?’	‘Do you want to go?’
<i>*Anata wa uresi-soo ka.</i>	<i>ka.</i>
you TOP happy-look.to.be	Q
‘Do you appear to be happy?’	
<i>*Anata wa iki-soo ka.</i>	<i>ka.</i>
you TOP go-look.to.be	Q
‘Do you appear to want to go?’	

Returning to expressions with the first-person *watasi* ‘I’ (repeated here)

<i>Watasi wa uresii.</i>	<i>Watasi wa iki-tai.</i>
<i>*Watasi wa uresi-sooda.</i>	<i>*Watasi wa iki-sooda.</i>

the reversal in acceptability observed when *ka* is added is exactly the flip side of the reversal with second-person *anata* ‘you’. In questions with *ka*, from the point of view of the listener, first-person address refers to the second-person and second-person address refers to the first-person. This circumstance can be considered to be the cause of these reversals in acceptability. That is to say, since the questions

Anata wa uresii ka.

and

**Watasi wa uresii ka.*

are respectively asking

Anata wa “watasi wa uresii” to omou ka.
 you TOP I TOP happy QUOT think Q
 ‘Are you thinking, “I am happy”?’

and

**Anata wa “anata wa uresii” to omou ka.*
 you TOP you TOP happy QUOT think Q
 ‘Are you thinking, “You are happy”?’

the acceptability is reversed. Concerning this point, third-person expressions, which do not involve a change of position between first- and second-person viewpoints, must be reflecting the character of *ka* straightforwardly. That is to say, with third-person expressions, addition of *ka* to an acceptable expression yields an acceptable expression, and addition of *ka* to an unacceptable expression yields an unacceptable expression, and thus, like *-nai* ‘NEG’ and *-ta* ‘PST’, the behavior of *ka* is “impersonal”. Furthermore, the behavior of sentence final particles that attach after *ka* in the world of predicational expressions is completely impersonal. It is hardly necessary to observe examples like the following to see that sentence-final particles attach to acceptable expressions and do not attach to unacceptable expressions, showing exactly the same behavior as *-nai* ‘NEG’ and *-ta* ‘PST’.

Watasi wa uresii ne (sa, yo). (*Watasi wa uresii.*)
 I TOP happy SFP I TOP happy
 ‘I am happy, aren’t I (you know, certainly)’ ‘I am happy’

Kare wa uresii ne (sa, yo).* (Kare wa uresii.*)
 He TOP happy SFP He TOP
 happy
 ‘He is happy, isn’t he (you know, certainly)’

Watasi wa iki-sooda ne (sa, yo).* (Watasi wa iki-sooda.*)
 I TOP go-be about.to SFP
 ‘I appear to be about to go, don’t I (you know, certainly)’

Kare wa iki-sooda ne (sa, yo). (*Kare wa iki-sooda.*)
 He TOP go-be about.to SFP
 ‘He appears to be about to go, doesn’t he (you know, certainly)’

This is undoubtedly a reflection of the fact that the sentences are formed when the speaker has distanced himself from the content he has described and has made it an “impersonal” statement. Along the way to this point, there is the world of “self” and “other”. The freedom for the speaker to choose to apprehend the content as belonging to “self” or to “other” or to be neutralized between the two exists up to the level of adding the auxiliary verbs *rasii*, *daroo*, or *-o*, but when the speaker reaches the sentence-final particle stage, the sentence has passed from belonging to “self” or “other” and is headed for the “impersonal” conclusion of the sentence. The auxiliary verbs themselves are the linguistic expression of whether the content is apprehended as “self” or “other”. Can we not say that there is a synchronic reason why we treat *daroo* and *-o* as auxiliary verbs even though they have already lost any inflection and are morphologically the equivalent of invariant particles?

The observations of this section, including those regarding the second-person, can be summarized in the following table.

<i>-tai, -sooda</i>	<i>-nai, -ta</i>	<i>rasii, daroo, -o</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>ne, sa, yo</i>
○ <i>Watasi wa uresii.</i>	○	△	*	○
* <i>Anata wa uresii.</i>	*	○	○	*
* <i>Kare wa uresii</i>	*	○	*	*
○ <i>Watasi wa iki-tai.</i>	○	△	*	○
* <i>Anata wa iki-tai.</i>	*	○	○	*
* <i>Kare wa iki-tai.</i>	*	○	*	*
* <i>Watasi wa uresi-sooda.</i>	*	△	○	*
○ <i>Anata wa uresi-sooda.</i>	○	△	*	○
○ <i>Kare wa uresi-sooda.</i>	○	△	○	○
* <i>Watasi wa iki-sooda.</i>	*	△	○	*
○ <i>Anata wa iki-sooda.</i>	○	△	*	○
○ <i>Kare wa iki-sooda</i>	○	△	○	○

○=acceptable * =unacceptable △=acceptable under an “otherized” interpretation, including strengthened “other” interpretation.

The table can be read as showing that Japanese, which has given the position of auxiliary verbs to *-tai* and *-sooda*, continues to have the freedom to choose “self” or “other” down to the level of *rasii*, *daroo*, and *-o*, but when it reaches the stage of sentence-final particles, the expression has firmed up and there is no choice left.

3.

Focusing on expressions taking *watasi* ‘I’, *kare* ‘he’, (and *anata* ‘you’) as subjects, we examined the import of introducing the concept of “self” versus “other” and saw that the concept has characteristics in common with the concept of “person”. If we are permitted to release the concept of “self” versus “other” from its involvement with expressions of “person” and expand our viewpoint, it is possible to consider developments in various other areas.

First of all, we will take up expressions closest to the “self” versus “other” expressions found in the predicates considered above: giving and receiving expressions like *yaru* ‘out-giving, self gives to another’, *morau* ‘receive, get, self receives from another’, and *kureru* ‘in-giving, another gives to self’.^d As is clear from the following examples, these expressions do not merely present an action as going from the doer (subject) to the receiver (dative case), but are expressions that capture the action as one conveying some benefit and have a flavor of introducing some value judgement and evaluation as in the adversity passive.

<i>Kare</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>yat-ta.</i>	<i>(age-ta)</i>
he	TOP	teach.GER	out.give-PST	
‘He did someone the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’				

<i>Kare</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>morat-ta.</i>	<i>(itadai-ta)</i>
he	TOP	teach.GER	receive-PST	
‘He got someone to teach/inform someone.’				

<i>Kare</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>kure-ta.</i>	<i>(kudasat-ta)</i>
he	TOP	teach.GER	in.give-PST	
‘He did someone (speaker) the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’				

In that sense, all three can be said to capture some event subjectively, but what that subjectivity consists of is definitely not simple. If we look at how these are linked to “person”, it is clear that only *kureru* is incompatible with *watasi* ‘I’ as subject and, to that extent, shows “other”-like behavior.

<i>Watasi</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>yat-ta.</i>	<i>(age-ta)</i>
I	TOP	teach.GER	out.give-PST	
‘I did someone the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’				

<i>Watasi</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>morat-ta.</i>	<i>(itadai-ta)</i>
I	TOP	teach.GER	receive-PST	
‘I got someone to teach/inform someone.’				

* <i>Watasi</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>osiete</i>	<i>kure-ta.</i>	<i>(kudasat-ta)</i>
I	TOP	teach.GER	in.give-PST	
‘I did someone (speaker) the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’				

^d [Translator’s note] When the “another” in the definition is socially higher than “self”, *yaru* is replaced by *ageru*, *morau* by *itadaku*, and *kureru* by *kudasaru*.

Incidentally, all three are acceptable with *anata* ‘you’ as subject, showing that *yaru* and *morau* have no “person” restriction on their subjects and, to that extent, unlike *kureru*, can be thought to exhibit “impersonal” behavior.

Anata wa osiete yat-ta. (age-ta)
 you TOP teach.GER out.give-PST
 ‘You did someone the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’

Anata wa osiete morat-ta. (itadai-ta)
 you TOP teach.GER receive-PST
 ‘You got someone to teach/inform someone.’

Anata wa osiete kure-ta. (kudasat-ta)
 you TOP teach.GER in.give-PST
 ‘You did someone (speaker) the favor of teaching/informing someone of something.’

However, in these cases, what stands in the dative position has “person” restrictions as shown by the unacceptability of the following, and it is clear that there is some involvement of “self” after all.

**Kare wa watasi ni osiete yat-ta.*
 he TOP I DAT teach.GER out.give-PST
 ‘He did someone the favor of teaching/informing me of something.’

**Kare wa watasi ni osiete morat-ta.*
 he TOP I DAT teach.GER receive-PST
 ‘He got me to teach/inform someone of something.’

Putting the above observations together yields the following.

		<i>watasi ni</i>	<i>anata ni</i>	<i>kanozzyo ni</i>
<i>yaru (ageru)</i>	<i>watasi wa</i>	/	○	○
	<i>anata wa</i>	★	/	○
	<i>kare wa</i>	★	○	○
<i>morau (itadaku)</i>	<i>watasi wa</i>	/	○	○
	<i>anata wa</i>	★	/	○
	<i>kare wa</i>	★	○	○
<i>kureru (kudasaru)</i>	<i>watasi wa</i>	/	★	★
	<i>anata wa</i>	○	/	○
	<i>kare wa</i>	○	○	○

This distribution of acceptability and unacceptability can be seen as capturing an opposition between *yaru* and *morau*, which reject *watasi ni* [I DAT], on the one hand and *kureru*, which rejects *watasi wa* [I TOP] on the other. At first glance, the rejection of *watasi wa* by *kureru* appears to be the same phenomenon as the rejection of *watasi wa* by *-sooda* in **Watasi wa iki-sooda* [I TOP go-look.to.be.about.to] because of its “other-ness” characteristic, but the nature of the rejection is quite different. Since *kureru* has the meaning of structurally placing a psychological focus on the recipient of the benefit of the action in the dative case, and thus is a dative “self” expression, it rejects placing “self” in the subject position. This is because the “self” focus cannot be placed on two locations at the same time. Of course, *morau* also places a psychological focus on the recipient of the benefits of the action, just as *kureru* does, but, since it is an expression in which the recipient of the benefits is in the subject position, it is a subject “self” expression and, in this sense, shares its benefactor subject / benefactor focus characteristics with *yaru* and stands in opposition to *kureru*. This is the reason *yaru* and *morau* reject “self” expressions in the dative position (**watasi ni* [I DAT]). *Yaru* and *morau*, for which the subject and focus positions coincide, can be seen as expressions describing the giving and receiving of favors between people under discussion and, in that sense, they are expressions in which the “self” focus is placed on the subject position and which shun *watasi ni* [I DAT] making its entrance wearing the focus of “self-ness” on its face. In contrast, *kureru* is an expression that separates the focus from the subject position and places its “self” focus on the dative, which structurally merely plays a supporting role. What makes that separation possible is a condition that requires the dative beneficiary to coincide with the speaker’s “self-oriented” feeling of being a beneficiary of the action. For example, the following sentence is acceptable, but it would probably not be used if the event were not something the speaker wished to happen.

Kare ga kanozyo ni osiete kureru.
 he NOM her DAT teach.GER in.give
 ‘He does me (the speaker) the favor of teaching/informing her.’

It would not be an overstatement to say that the true beneficiary of this expression is the unspoken “for me, in accordance with my wishes”. Giving and receiving expressions, through the giving and receiving of benefits, have a strong flavor of “self-ness” and under normal circumstances the focus of the benefits is the speaker. Therefore, if one puts *watasi ni* in the dative slot, that ends up becoming an expression of the speaker’s “self”. One gets the impression that by rejecting *watasi ni*, the verbs *yaru* and *morau* just barely manage to place the “self-ness” on the level of persons under discussion. If the speaker himself stands in the focus of the “self-ness” of the transfer of benefits, as in the following sentence, the speaker himself is made the benefactor and *kureru* ends up appearing as an expression with a benefactor subject benefactor focus.

Hitotu konzyoo o tatakinaosite kureru.^c
 one disposition ACC beat.into.shape.GER bestow
 ‘Do (the hearer) the favor of correcting (the hearer’s) (bad) attitude.’

^c Translator’s note: The restriction to in-giving on *kureru* is a contemporary one. In pre-contemporary usage, and in a number of present-day dialects, *kureru* also expresses out-giving, as it does in this example.

If these giving and receiving expressions are added to the ordering of auxiliary verbs, they usually occur between the “voice” auxiliaries *-sase* ‘causative’ and *-rare* ‘passive’ and the “self” – “other” auxiliaries *-tai* ‘desiderative’ and *-sooda* ‘look to be’, as shown below.

<i>Osie-sasete</i>	<i>YARU (morau, kureru)</i>
Teach-CAUS.GER	out.give (receive, in.give)
‘Do someone the favor of making someone teach someone something (YARU).’	
‘Get someone to make someone teach someone something (MORAU).’	
‘Someone does me (the speaker) of making someone teach someone something (KURERU).’	

<i>(Kawarini)</i>	<i>sikara-rete</i>	<i>YARU (morau, kureru)</i>
in.someone’s.place	scold-PASS.GER	out.give (receive, in.give)
‘Do someone the favor of taking their scolding. (YARU)’		
‘Get someone to take someone else’s scolding. (MORAU).’		
‘Do me (the speaker) the favor of taking my scolding. (KURERU)’		

<i>Osiete</i>	<i>yari (morai)</i>	<i>-tai.</i>
teach.GER	out.give (receive)	-DES
‘I want to do someone the favor of teaching them. (YARU)’		
‘I want to get someone to do me the favor of teaching someone something. (MORAU)’		

<i>Osiete</i>	<i>yari (morai, kure)</i>	<i>-sooda.</i>
teach.GER	out.give (receive, in.give)	-look.to.be.about.to
‘It looks like someone will do someone else the favor of teaching someone something. (YARU)’		
‘It looks like someone will get someone to do them the favor of teaching someone something. (MORAU)’		
‘It looks like someone will do me (the speaker) the favor of teaching someone something. (KURERU)’		

Of all the possible combinations, the unacceptability of the following stands out,

* <i>Osiete</i>	<i>kure</i>	<i>-tai</i>
teach.GER	in-give	-DES

but this is unacceptable because, as described earlier, *kureru* is an expression that places the speaker’s strong “self” in the dative element and is incompatible with *-tai*, which imposes the speaker’s “self” on the subject argument. The speaker standing in the dative position with *kureru* and the speaker standing in the subject position with *-tai* each express their respective “selves”. As such these are complementary forms. That is, the speaker’s desire to receive benefits expressed in

<i>Osiete</i>	<i>moraitai.</i>
‘I (the speaker) want to get someone to teach me something.’	

is realized in the speaker’s receipt of benefits as expressed by

Osiete *kureru.*
 ‘(Someone) does me (the speaker) the favor of teaching me something.’

-*Tai* is a “self” state expressing a desire and *kureru* is a “self” event fulfilling that desire and the two complement each other. In this sense, *kureru* is an expression on the level of *-tai*.
 Thus,

Osiete *yatte* *kureru.*
 teach.GER out.give.GER in.give
 ‘Someone does me (the speaker) the favor of teaching someone else something.’

and

Osiete *moratte* *kureru.*
 teach.GER receive.GER in.give
 ‘Someone A does me (the speaker) the favor of getting someone B to teach someone A something.’

are acceptable expressions, but the following are not.

**Osiete* *kurete* *yaru.*^f
 teach.GER in.give.GER out.give
 ‘Someone does someone else the favor of doing me the favor of teaching someone something.’

**Osiete* *kurete* *morau.*
 teach.GER in.give.GER receive
 ‘Someone gets someone else to do me the favor of teaching someone something.’

In terms of the relative ordering of giving and receiving verbs, both the following are acceptable, but that is undoubtedly because the “self-ness” of *yaru* and *morau* is, as described earlier, between persons under discussion and is on a level of a description of an objective state of affairs.

Osiete *yatte* *morau.*
 teach.GER out.give.GER receive
 ‘Someone gets someone else to do someone the favor of teaching yet a third person something.’

Osiete *moratte* *yaru.*
 teach.GER receive.GER out.give
 ‘Someone does someone else the favor of getting someone to teach someone something.’

Yaru and *morau*, which differ as to whether to make the giver of favors the subject or to make the recipient of favors the subject, can be judged to have a nature close to the level of that of

^f Translator’s note: Although unacceptable in Modern Standard Japanese, this sentence was possible in pre-contemporary Japanese and in a number of present-day dialects.

causatives and passives, which differ on whether to make the agent the subject or to make the patient subject. This is why *yaru* and *morau*, which can co-occur in either order with respect to each other, must always appear in the preceding position when they co-occur with *kureru*.

Assuming it is possible to capture the way things are in terms of “self” versus “other” at the level of propositional content, there is probably some value to expanding our scope and examining whether this perspective can be applied internal to declarative statements. For example, in contrast to the majority of verbs with which a first-person subject is incompatible with “other” predicates, as shown below,

**Watasi wa iki (oyogi, nomi, iki...) -sooda.*
 I TOP go (swim, drink, live...)
 ‘I look like I am about to go (swim, drink, live...).’

there are a minority of verbs like the following for which such a construction is acceptable.

Watasi wa taore (obore, haki, sini...) -sooda.
 I TOP collapse (drown, vomit, die...)
 ‘I look like I am about to collapse (drown, vomit, die...).’

The verbs in this group all carry the common evaluative meaning of being an undesirable event and, with a first-person subject can probably be ranked with “other” verbs in which the event happens on its own regardless of the will of the subject. In fact, any verb can become acceptable in this construction, provided it is evaluated as representing an event the subject should or would like to avoid.

Watasi wa iki (oyogi, nomi, iki...) -sooda.
 I TOP go (swim, drink, live...)
 ‘I look like I am about to go (swim, drink, live...).’

But rather than a temporary, ad hoc evaluation, it is verbs that have a permanent feature of “other-ness” that seem to be able to appear in such a construction most readily. Also, for example, if we show the intersection of the opposition between the set of adjectives and nominal adjectives that can only appear with sentient subjects and those that can only appear with non-sentient subjects and between “self”-oriented and “other”-oriented adjectives, we observe the pattern below.

Sentient Subject		Non-sentient Subject
<i>uresii</i> ‘happy’	<i>otonasii</i> ‘quiet’	<i>buatui</i> ‘thick’
<i>sabisii</i> ‘lonely’	<i>takumasii</i> ‘robust’	<i>akarui</i> ‘bright’
<i>suki-da</i> ‘fond’	<i>sunao-da</i> ‘frank’	<i>sizuka-da</i> ‘silent’
etc	etc	etc
<div style="border-top: 1px solid black; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div> “Self-oriented”	<div style="border-top: 1px solid black; width: 100%; margin-top: 5px;"></div> “Other-oriented”	

The psychological reaction one has when encountering something basically should be expressed with a sentient subject, but these reactions are divided depending on whether they are depicted as being “self-oriented” or “other-oriented”. Of the latter kind of depictions, non-sentient subject adjectives or nominal adjectives also comprise one part. This movement is captured in the intersecting categorization above. The question can conceivably be developed in the direction of saying that when saying *sabisii* ‘lonely’ or *tanosii* ‘pleasant’, one is reporting a “self-oriented” reaction absorbed in subjectivity and when saying *tumaranai* ‘boring’ or *omosiroi* ‘interesting’, one is beginning to move toward an “other-oriented” reaction focused on objectivity.

The “self-oriented” adjectives and nominal adjectives given here form a group that can only take *watasi wa* [I TOP] as their subjects and that cannot co-occur with *zuibun* ‘very, extremely’ and, with this, our discussion has returned to the questions raised at the beginning of this work. Reversing our observations, we can consider adverbs that behave like *zuibun* to be “other-oriented” adverbs and we may be able to establish a subcategorization of adverbs. Detailed consideration is left to future research, but looking only at degree adverbs, they can probably be categorized as follows.

“Other-oriented” adverbs: *zuibun* ‘very, extremely’, *zutto* ‘by far’, *yohodo* ‘much, to a great extent’, *issoo* ‘still more’, *haruka-ni* ‘by far’, *itatte* ‘exceedingly’, *daibun* ‘considerably’, *sootoo* ‘considerably’, *kanari* ‘fairly, quite’, *nakanaka* ‘very, highly’, *wari-ni* ‘relatively’, *kekko* ‘reasonably, quite’, *goku* ‘extremely’, ...

“Self-oriented” adverbs: *taihen* ‘very, greatly’, *hizyoo-ni* ‘extremely’, *kiwamete* ‘extremely’, *hanahada* ‘very, greatly’, *totemo* ‘very’, *baka-ni* ‘ridiculously’, *yake-ni* ‘awfully’, *sukosi* ‘a little’, *tyotto* ‘slightly’, *isasaka* ‘a bit’, ...

If this is correct in the main, we have a third, different principle for categorizing degree adverbs, in addition to discovery versus comparative and evaluative versus non-evaluative, that can be expected to provide a three-dimensional grasp of the system of degree adverbs.

These observations may have strayed from the realm of syntax into the realm of semantics. Returning discussion to the realm of syntax, the “self” versus “other” perspective may be effective concerning a problem in conjunction. In the following sentence, the subject, the adverb, and the predicate are all “other-oriented” and the sentence is completely acceptable.

<i>Kare</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>zuibun</i>	<i>ranbooda.</i>
he	TOP	extremely	reckless

‘He is extremely reckless.’

However, if the sentence is continued using a hypothetical conditional expression, it becomes unacceptable, regardless of the difference between the confirmatory or hypothetical nature of it.

* <i>Kare</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>zuibun</i>	<i>ranboo nara, ...</i>
he	NOM	extremely	reckless COP.PROV

‘If he is extremely reckless, ...’

**Kare ga zuibun ranboo demo, ...*
 he NOM extremely reckless COP.CONC
 ‘Even if he is extremely reckless, ...’

If, on the other hand, it is followed by confirmatory conjunction, it is acceptable, showing a complete opposition.

Kare wa zuibun ranbooda kara, ...
 he TOP extremely reckless because
 ‘Because he is extremely reckless, ...’

Kare wa zuibun ranbooda keredomo, ...
 he TOP extremely reckless but
 ‘He is extremely reckless, but ...’

The situation can be said to be roughly the same with other “other-oriented” expressions. A conditional expression is an expression in which the speaker imagines and describes a situation that has not yet been realized while, on the other hand, a construction with a confirmatory conjunction is an expression of an already realized situation that the speaker accepts. Thus, one might think that a conditional expression can be seen to conjoin as a “self-oriented” conjunction and a confirmatory conjunction as an “other-oriented” conjunction. However, the fact that the exact same phenomenon is observed with adverbs that are known to be “self-oriented”, as shown below, is sufficient to make one hesitate to jump to such a facile conclusion.

Semete kanreki made tutome-tai
 at.least age.60 until work-DES
 ‘I want to work at least until I turn 60.’

(**Semete kanreki made tutome-sooda.*)
 at.least age.60 until work-look.to.be.about.to
 ‘I look to be about to work until I turn 60.’

**Semete kanreki made tutome-takereba, ...*
 at.least age.60 until work-DES.PROV
 ‘If I want to work at least until I turn 60, ...’

**Semete kanreki made tutome-takutemo, ...*
 at.least age.60 until work-DES.CONC
 ‘Even if I want to work at least until I turn 60, ...’

Semete kanreki made tutome-tai ara, ...
 at.least age.60 until work-DES since
 ‘Since I want to work at least until I turn 60, ...’

Semete kanreki made tutome-tai keredomo, ...
 at.least age.60 until work-DES but
 ‘I want to work at least until I turn 60, but ...’

It is already known that elements that include an evaluative meaning tend to appear with expressions of already realized situations,³ and, while an explanation along the lines of confirmatory conjunctions being already realized may be overly broad, be that as it may, consideration of an already realized situation as something the speaker has no choice but to accept and thus included in “other” is something that can be thought to have merit.

One topic that can be taken up with no worry of leaving the realm of syntax is the “other-ness” of the *noda* construction. The difference between the sentences with and without *noda* below has been a topic of discussion in the world of Japanese language education.⁴

<i>Watasi wa uresii.</i>	<i>Watasi wa iku.</i>
I TOP happy	I TOP go
‘I am happy.’	‘I go.’
<i>Watasi wa uresii noda.</i>	<i>Watasi wa iku noda..</i>
I TOP happy NODA	I TOP go NODA
‘It’s a matter of my being happy.’	‘It’s a matter of my going.’

Expressions that are unacceptable with “other” subjects become acceptable if *noda* is added.

<i>Kare wa uresii noda.</i>	(* <i>Kare wa uresii.</i>)
he TOP happy NODA	he TOP happy
‘It’s a matter of his being happy.’	‘He is happy.’
<i>Kare wa iki-tai noda.</i>	(* <i>Kare wa iki-tai.</i>)
he TOP go-DES NODA	he TOP go-DES
‘It’s a matter of his wanting to go.’	‘He wants to go.’

Unless the subject undergoes “otherization”, expressions that are unacceptable with first-person subjects do not change in acceptability with the addition of *noda*, and the “other-ness” of the *noda* construction is clear.

* <i>Watasi wa uresi-soona noda.</i>	(* <i>Watasi wa uresi-sooda.</i>)
I TOP happy-look.to.be NODA	
‘It’s a matter of my appearing to be happy.’	
* <i>Watasi wa iki-soona noda.</i>	(* <i>Watasi wa ikisoo-da.</i>)
I TOP go.look.to.be.about to NODA	
‘It’s a matter of my appearing to be about to go.’	

The addition of *noda* linguistically allows the descriptive content of the predicate, which is structurally inseparable from the modality of the sentence without *noda*, to be separated and bound to the *no*, with a new modal content provided by the assertive copular predicate *da*. This separation of the descriptive content is for the purpose of placing the descriptive content squarely on the target of the modality, and this objectification of the expression is nothing other than the “otherization” described in this work. The fact that the following sentence can sometimes be taken as an assertion and sometimes as an explanation is no doubt due to the objectivizing effect of “otherization”.

Watasi wa iku noda.
 I TOP go NODA
 ‘The fact of the matter is that I am going.’

The fact that the following sentence can be taken as a pessimistic forecast is probably due to its being an expression of something that is out of the speaker’s hands, due to “otherization”.

Kanozyo mo iku nodaroo.
 she also go NODA.CONJEC
 ‘It’s probably the case that she will go, too.’

To begin with, these expressional effects are possible contingent on the fact that, after being “otherized” by the addition of *no* ‘act, fact, matter’, the expression is ultimately reasserted with the speaker’s modality included. An expression that makes into a speaker’s judgement something that has already been divorced from the speaker as being in a world out of the speaker’s reach becomes an expression of either something that goes without saying, or of something that is out of the speaker’s hands. Moreover, this is not just the case for *noda*, but also for forms like those below that, while taking the form of a formal noun with *da* attached, can be considered to be expressions that, in common with subjectless “irregular predicates”,⁵ cannot have a subject supplied for them and thus are subjective expressions that the speaker uses to express his own attitudinal pose.

<i>hazuda</i> expectation.COP ‘should’	<i>tameda</i> for.the.sake.of.COP ‘in order to/because’	<i>tokoroda</i> circumstance.COP ‘just did/just about to’	
<i>dakeda</i> only.COP ‘that’s all’	<i>toorida</i> that.way.COP ‘as stated/expected’	<i>-sooda</i> hearsay.COP ‘they say’	<i>-yooda</i> appearance.COP ‘it looks like’

Since they are expressions that cannot be supplied with a subject, they offer an almost auxiliary verb-like impression. That is probably why *-sooda* and *-yooda* have come to be treated as auxiliary verbs and if these two are, then it may be that all of this group, from *noda* and *hazuda* on down, should be as well. But they need not be, and I think it is more appropriate to characterize them as irregular predicates formed of formal nouns with *da* added and thus “otherized” before being used to express one’s stance.

Finally, I will take up a problem that I think shows that the “self” versus “other” perspective is effective diachronically as well: the changes in demonstratives. The modern Japanese demonstrative system is illustrated below.

Proximal: <i>ko</i> -series	Things close to the speaker
Mesial: <i>so</i> -series	Things close to the hearer
Distal: <i>a</i> -series	Things far from both the speaker and the hearer

However, the Classical Japanese demonstratives corresponding to the *ko*-, *so*-, *a*-series, [*ko*, *so*, *ka*], are known to not always match the modern demonstratives in use. For example, the *kore* in the following refers to Taira no Narimasa, who is not present at the scene and thus a distal form

might be expected, or, since he has become the topic for discussion among Seishōnagon and her party, perhaps the mesial could be expected, but it is the proximal form that is used.⁶

Naho *rei.no.hito* *no* *yau.ni,* *kore*
even.so ordinary.people GEN like that.person

na.warahi.so
do.not.laugh
'Even so, do not laugh at him like ordinary people (would).'
Makurasōshi 5-dan

On the other hand, since in the following sentence, the *sa* refers to something the speaker has said, a proximal form would be expected, but the mesial appears.

"*Sate* *nanigoto* *zo*" *to* *notamawasureba,*
well what SFP QUOT said.since

mousituru *koto* *wo* "*sanan*" *to* *satosureba,*
said.PST thing TOP such QUOT said.when
'Since the Empress asked me, "Well then, what happened?" I told her such and such and then...'
Makurasōshi 5-dan

This is probably a fact that can be understood by thinking that the uses here may be due to the proximal *ko* series being used in Classical Japanese to indicate something related to "self" (Narimasa was the owner of the house where the Empress was living) and the mesial *so* series being used to indicate something not related to oneself, that is something "other" (even one's own thoughts, once they have been uttered, become separated from oneself). It appears that the system of demonstratives changed from such a "self" versus "other" subjective system to a more objective system based on speaker's territory versus hearer's territory, but I would like to think that when that happened the reason the proximal series came to indicate the speaker's territory was because it originally indicated a "self" relation, and the mesial series came to indicate the hearer's territory because it originally indicated an "other" relation.

Ever since hitting upon the "self" versus "other" perspective, although not neatly packaged, I have felt that it looks to be widely and deeply involved in both grammatical and semantic theory. I intended to present a part of that on this occasion, but that it has wound up being an enumeration of problems is a direct reflection of my lack of organization. I would like to continue the description and interpretation of this phenomenon and invite your criticisms, suggestions, and encouragement.

¹ Watanabe, Minoru. 1990. Teidofukushi no taikai [The system of degree adverbs]. Jōchi Daigaku Kokubungaku Ronshū 23: 1-16.

² Watanabe, Minoru. 1953. Jojutsu to chinjutsu [Predication and modality]. Kokugogaku 13/14: 20-34.

³ Kudō, Hiroshi. 1983. Teidofukushi o megutte [Concerning degree adverbs]. In Watanabe, Minoru (Ed.), *Fukuyōgo no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

⁴ For example, Saji, Keizō. 1981. “~noda no honshitsu [The true nature of *noda*]. Nichigo Gakushūyo Kenkyū Number 3. Beijing Taigai Bōeki Gakuin. See also, Tanomura, Tadaharu. 1991. *Gendai Nihongo no bunpō 1: Noda no imi to yōhō* [Modern Japanese grammar 1: The meaning and uses of *noda*]. *Kokugogaku* 164: 71-76.

⁵ Watanabe, Minoru. *Heianchō bunshōshi* [History of Heian court composition]. Chapter 10. Tokyo: Chikuma Gakugei Bunko.

⁶ Horiguchi, Kazuyoshi. Shijishi *ko/so/a* kō [Concerning the demonstratives *ko/so/a*]. In Hamada Keisuke (Ed.), *Ronshū Nihonbungaku-Nihongo 5: Gendai*. Tokyo: Kadokawa, Hashimoto, Shirō. 1981. Shijigo no shiteki tenkai [The historical development of demonstratives]. In Morioka, Kenji (Ed.), *Kōza nihongogaku 2*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin. The general idea expressed here is based on personal comments on a DEA thesis written by Tokimoto Rie, a graduate of the French Department of the Languages Division of Sophia University, and the examples quoted here are from her thesis.

ORIGINAL PAPER

WATANABE Minoru, 1991, “Wagakoto-hitogoto” no kanten to bunpōron, *Kokugogaku* 165, Kokugo Gakkai [The Society for Japanese Linguistics], pp. 1-14.

Translated by John H. Haig (University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa)

Proofed by Stephen Wright HORN